

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 386

EA 016 346

AUTHOR Hills, Jean
TITLE The Preparation of Educational Leaders: What's Needed and What's Next?
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
REPORT NO UCEA-OP-8303
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 26p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Principles; *Administrator Education; Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; Evaluation Criteria; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Organizational Theories; Relevance (Education); School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This essay formulates some recommendations for educational administrator preparation programs and predicts the course of their future development. While the case of medical practice as a paradigm for the practice of educational administration is found only generally useful, the clinical analogy yields the suggestion that educational leader preparation should emphasize a well-focused clinical concern for the effectiveness of educational organizations in the attainment of collective goals and the prevention and treatment of conditions impairing effectiveness. Preparation programs should also be grounded in a holistic conception of practice emphasizing maintenance of systematic essential functions of the administrator, should address the problem of the value system of the school and its implications for the current emphasis on outcomes of education, and should cultivate an understanding of the function of the school in the societal system and its implications for administrative practice. The forecast for preparation programs is that little improvement will be made due to limiting conditions imposed by the complex and unpredictable nature of administrative practice, by the state of knowledge of administrative practice (which does not yet offer tested problem solutions, valid and relevant empirical generalizations, and valid theoretical principles), and by certain characteristics of university departments of educational administration inherent in their resemblance to academic disciplines. (MJL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED239386

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Charles A.
Wilkins*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A UCEA OCCASIONAL PAPER

THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS:
WHAT'S NEEDED AND WHAT'S NEXT?

by

Jean Hills
University of British Columbia

#8303

OFFICE COPY

DO NOT REMOVE

EA 015 316



The University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (614) 422-2564

UCEA OCCASIONAL PAPERS

UCEA Occasional Papers are additional means of helping advance educational administration. The intent of this series of documents is to help exchange reports of ideas and activities more quickly than generally possible through conventional publications and journals.

The current series of Occasional Papers concentrates on information and insights that will be useful in the design and implementation of more effective professional preparation programs. If this approach to sharing ideas is productive, additional topics will be included in other series.

Each paper is expected to be no more than 25 to 30 pages, single spaced. Identification of sources for additional information about the topic is encouraged.

A decision on publishing a manuscript in the UCEA Occasional Papers series will be based on recommendations of panelists selected for their expertise relating to the topic. Four copies of each manuscript to be considered for inclusion in the UCEA Occasional Paper series are required. Only one copy will be returned to the author(s).

For further information, contact:

Editor, UCEA Occasional Papers
University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Room 066
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Telephone: (614) 422-2564

THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS:
WHAT'S NEEDED AND WHAT'S NEXT?

Jean Hills
University of British Columbia

Paper presented at a UCEA Conference on Educational Leadership in honor of Jack A. Culbertson, University of Texas at Austin, May 1982.

Permission is granted to reproduce all or any portion to this document for personal and classroom use provided credit is granted to the author and to UCEA. Additional copies of this paper may be obtained from the University Council for Educational Administration, 29 W. Woodruff Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43210, for ~~\$3.70~~ each.

~~#3.25~~

INTRODUCTION

In view of the fact that it may be perceived as a slight deviation from the topic assigned to me, it seems appropriate to begin this presentation with a brief account of how it came to have its present form - particularly its dual emphasis on what's needed and what's next in the preparation of educational leaders. Communications with the conference organizers left some room for uncertainty with respect to which of those two emphasis was to be the focus of my assignment. An early telephone conversation seemed to stress the first and a subsequent letter stressed the second. An effort to choose between the two led to the development of a preliminary outline of an approach to each, and then to alternate efforts on both. The plan was to complete both and then select the better of the two. However, in the process of implementing that plan it became apparent that both could be treated as parts of a single paper structured and entitled as it now is.

The presentation, then, comprises two major sections. The first is addressed to the question of what's needed in the preparation of educational leaders. This section is essentially a modification and an extension of my own previously expressed views on the matter (Hills, 1980). The second is addressed to the question of what's next in the preparation of educational leaders. This section advances a prediction based on impressions of the current state of the field.

What's Needed

In May of 1978, at the Fourth International Intervisitation Conference in Educational Administration, held in Vancouver, British Columbia, I presented a paper entitled, "Critical Issues in the Preparation of Educational Administrators in North America." Although the title does not indicate it clearly, that presentation was addressed to the same question as this section of today's paper, namely, "What's needed in the preparation of educational leaders?" The 1978 paper concluded, among other things, that what was needed were preparation programs having the following characteristics:

- 1) A firm basis in a more or less clearly defined and fully institutionalized set of clinical values specifying the desirable state of the object of clinical interest.
- 2) A firm grounding in, and close relationships with, the relevant academic disciplines.
- 3) A substantial component of specialized knowledge, mobilized from the relevant disciplines and clinical experience, and organized around the problems of practice.
- 4) A strong emphasis on the values of cognitive rationality and instrumental rationality.
- 5) A clear conception of the common problem of clinical practice.
- 6) A pattern of arrangements that facilitates the internalization of values. (Hills, 1980)

While appearing to me to be no less valid today than they were four years ago, those conclusions were derived from an analysis that was incomplete in several important respects. What I shall attempt to do in today's presentation is to extend the previous analysis in ways that seem particularly appropriate in view of subsequent investigations and recent discussions in the literature of the field. In order for that extension to make a modest amount of sense, I turn now to a brief recapitulation of that which is to be corrected and extended.

Educational Administration as a Special Case

The 1978 presentation treated the problem of preparing persons for practice in educational administration as a special case of the more general problem of preparing persons for practice in an applied profession. Using medicine as the prototypical case of a well developed applied profession, it emphasized the centrality of a clinical focus for those professions. That is to say, the primacy of an orientation to a clinical focus was taken to be the defining characteristic of an applied profession, or a clinical discipline.

In contrast to the academic disciplines, they are concerned with the finding and effective implementation of solutions to concrete practical problems where serious interests of clients are often at stake (Parsons & Platt, 1973). In medicine, of course, the type of problem that is the focus of concern is that of health.

Now, the identification of health problems poses few difficulties, even for the layman. However, as an aid to thinking about what might be identified as problems of administration, it seems useful to ask several naive questions, namely, "What is health?", and "What is a health problem?". If we confine our discussion to the somatic case, then a minimal definition of health might be "possession of the performance capacities considered normal at a particular stage of the life-course." Insofar as particular persons possess normal performance capacities, health is an empirical condition. But, health is also a value, a conception of the desirable state of the individual person.

Health problems, of course, are diseases, illnesses, and injuries. But what are these and how do they come to be so designated? There is nothing inherent in the state termed tuberculosis which requires that we call it a disease. Its occurrence is as much a natural phenomenon as any other. Quite clearly, a disease, illness, or injury is a state of the individual person which constitutes, or leads to, an impairment of performance capacities. Equally clearly, the designation of a particular state as diseased is neither arbitrary nor given in the nature of the state itself. It is relative to the conception of the desirable.

The point to be emphasized here is that the problems of medical practice, which constitute the clinical focus of the profession, are defined in relation to the conception of the desirable state of the object of clinical interest, i.e. the individual person as a physiological entity. Since that conception is shared widely, and since there is a great deal of commonality among individuals in the types of impairments to which they are susceptible, it is possible to identify a range of common problems for the profession.

The medical case is a useful example. It illustrates with particular clarity at least four senses in which the clinical focus is significant to an applied profession. The first sense is in specifying clearly what it is the practitioner is being prepared to do, or the range of problems that preparation programs should equip him or her to solve. Physicians, of course, are prepared not simply to minister to the ill, but to solve a variety of quite specific problems of health and illness.

The second sense of significance follows from the first. In specifying the kinds of problem that practitioners are to be equipped to solve, the focus provides criteria for the determination of what knowledge is relevant and to be mastered as a qualification for admission to practice. In medicine, knowledge is mobilized selectively from a variety of disciplines, and from clinical experience and research, in terms of its relevance to the solution of the problems of practice. "The so-called science of medicine is not itself,

a discipline, but a body of knowledge put together for its relevance to the medical practitioner and drawn from many different disciplines." (Parson, 1978, 137)

It is interesting to note in passing that agreement regarding the answer to the question of what one needs to know in order to practice medicine is sufficiently high in the United States to permit nearly half of the 50 states to use the same licensing examination, and for there to be standard textbooks designed to help those who are preparing for such examinations. That level of consensus would seem quite improbable without an even higher degree of consensus on the problems of practice.

Once selected, of course, knowledge must be organized in some manner, and that is the third sense in which the clinical focus has significance. Because the solution of practical problems requires the mobilization of knowledge from a number of sources, ". . . the applied professions reorganize knowledge in terms of relevance to the practical goals and interests which the profession serves." (Parsons & Platt, 1973, 231-32) In the well developed cases, the knowledge of the applied professions is highly systematized and it is the problems of practice which provide the basis for that systemization. The body of knowledge termed "medical science", particularly the subcategory termed "clinical science", is codified under such broad headings as "surgery", "internal medicine", "pediatrics", etc. And within the category "internal medicine" we find such subcategories as "diseases of the circulation", "diseases of the lung", "infectious diseases", etc.

The fourth and final sense in which the clinical focus has significance for an applied profession is in providing an answer to the question, "What are the most important research questions to be answered?" Whatever balance a particular field may strike between "basic" and "applied" research at a particular time, the ultimate concern of the applied profession is finding and implementing solutions to clinical problems.

The case in educational administration. Clearly the case in our own field is very different from the situation just described. We have no clearly articulated, widely agreed-upon clinical focus. And that means we do not have a clearly articulated, widely shared definition of the object of clinical interest, a conception of its desirable state, or a range of common problems. As I have observed elsewhere (Hills, 1979a, 1979b), we might agree that the organizational unit for which the administrator assumes responsibility is the object of clinical interest. And we might also agree that effectiveness in bringing about the changes in knowledge, character, and skill levels, or developing the commitments and capacities, deemed essential to the performance of adult roles, is a fundamental component of most conceptions of the desirable school. However, if we treat that conception as the parallel of "possession of normal performance capacities" in medicine, then we are led to ask, "What constitutes the parallel of disease or illness?" In other words, what common conditions constitute, or lead to, impaired organizational effectiveness? Answers to that question simultaneously answer another question, namely, "What are the common problems of practice that might serve in the four capacities already

mentioned: (1) specifying what the practitioner is to be prepared to do; (2) providing criteria in terms of which to determine what knowledge is relevant; (3) providing the basis for the organization of relevant knowledge, and; (4) providing an answer to the question of what research is needed most?"

The conclusion that I reached on the basis of the kind of analysis just outlined was that we needed to know a great deal more about the states of educational organizations that impair their effectiveness. (Hills, 1979a, 1979b) That is neither a remarkable nor a novel conclusion. Others before and since have, for different reasons, reached similar conclusions. Erickson (1977a, 1977b, 1979) has been advocating a stronger emphasis on school outcomes, or effects, both in research and in preparation programs, since 1974. More recently, Spady (1981) has been emphasizing the need for what he terms a "fundamental shift from role-based to goal-based organization in education." Still more recently, Boyd and Crowson (1981) have reported a trend toward an outcome, or goal-based, reorientation of administrative practice and stressed the need for a similar reorientation in research and preparation programs. However, in company with my own previous analysis, the arguments of these authors omit two considerations that have important implications for preparation programs. In addition, as intimated earlier, my own analysis was incomplete. In what follows I shall deal first with the problem of incompleteness specific to my own analysis, and then with the omissions common to it and other views.

Incompleteness of the Previous Analysis

Although there may be other shortcomings as well, my previous analysis was incomplete in two major respects, both of which bear importantly on the question of what is needed in the preparation of educational leaders. In that analysis, I took medical practice as the prototypical case of applied professional practice and used it paradigmatically to identify preparation needs in educational administration. However, medical practice does not map precisely onto administrative practice, and the points of mis-match yielded the aforementioned elements of incompleteness. First, unlike the administrator, the physician is not concerned with the control and management of the normal, day-to-day, routine functioning of the object of clinical interest. For the most part, he or she becomes involved only when problems arise, i.e., when performance capacity is threatened or impaired. Put another way, medical practice is concerned primarily with the treatment of disease, not with the maintenance or promotion of health. Administration, on the other hand, at least as commonly conceived in its desirable form, is very much concerned about the maintenance and promotion of organizational effectiveness. Recognition of that fact leads to the suggestion that, like some nursing training programs that are based on a holistic conception of treatment, administrator preparation programs would include a focus on the maintenance of essential functions as well as on the solution of specific problems. Although some writers in the field reject it (Willower, 1980; Boyd and Crowson, 1981), the conception of a system, the stability of which is contingent upon the fulfillment of imperative functions holds some promise in this regard. In any case, it would seem particularly useful for the

for the administrator to have an empirically grounded conception of the positive conditions of organizational effectiveness.

The import of the immediately preceding discussion is that an exclusively problem-centered preparation program would be too narrow. The administrator who is prepared only to solve specific effectiveness problems would leave a great deal undone that would eventually create such problems. Even a program expanded to include a holistic emphasis would be narrower than is desirable, for what a preparation program should do is provide opportunities to learn the set of qualities most closely associated with successful performance of administrative functions. Thus, in addition to needing more detailed information about the problems of practice and their solutions, and about the positive conditions of effectiveness, we need to know what principles of conduct and patterns of behavior are associated with administrative success, and we need to know how to facilitate their development.

A second point of mis-match between medical practice and administrative practice concerns the degree to which the two types of practitioners function as integral parts of the systems with which they are concerned. Unlike the administrator, the physician is not an integral part of the system that is the object of clinical interest, and he/she is probably less often than the administrator the very cause of the impairments needing treatment. The conclusion to which that observation leads complements the one just stated. Not only could preparation benefit from a well validated conception of a system confronted by imperative functions, it could benefit equally from a validated conception of the functions of the administrator within that system. We do not have, and are very much in need of, an accurate characterization of the functions of the administrator couched in terms more general and systematic than those of everyday language.

Common Omissions

The value system of the school. The first of the two errors of omission common to my own previous analysis and the positions articulated by Erickson, Spady, and Boyd and Crowson, is a failure to give explicit attention to the value system of the school. The authors mentioned as well as others (Meyer and Rowan, 1977, 1978; Michaelsen, 1980, 1981), attach considerable emphasis to the observation that school personnel place little stress on educational outcomes and on adherence standards of instrumental rationality in the selection of means for attaining goals. Administrators are reported to devote far more time to maintenance than to goal-attainment types of activities (Boyd and Crowson, 1981), school personnel are said to rarely make use of student achievement data to evaluate the performance of either teachers or schools (Meyer and Rowan, 1978), and the behavior of school personnel in relation to the attainment of educational goals is said to be non-rational (Michaelsen, 1981). While it is undoubtedly appropriate, on these and other grounds, to emphasize outcomes, goal-based approaches, and instrumentally rational behavior in both practice and preparation, such an emphasis, untempered by other considerations, could have serious consequences.

As I see it, the problem is this. Even though those who advocate an

emphasis on collective effectiveness, outcomes, or goal-attainment allow for the possibility of multiple outcomes (e.g., affective as well as cognitive outcomes), they fail to recognize what I take to be the special character of the value system of the school, which makes a sharp focus even on a plurality of discrete outcomes unrealistic. Although I remain dissatisfied with my ability to formulate the matter in a conceptually coherent manner, and despite a lack of firm evidence, I have a strong hunch that the nature of the value system of the school, or the conception of the mission of the school shared by school personnel, is such that the very strong emphasis on the rational pursuit of discrete educational outcomes advocated by some writers is not only unrealistic, but also potentially disruptive. Boyd and Crowson (1981), anticipating opposition to their stress on an outcomes, discounted the possibility of goal distortion by suggesting that we have learned enough to measure a variety of outcomes, including those of an affective sort. That may be true, but it misses the point of concern there, for the unreservedly rational pursuit of even a plurality of discrete outcomes seems inconsistent with the value system of the school. I shall try to explain.

The conception of the desirable state of the object of clinical interest--the student, in this case--which legitimizes the efforts of school personnel seems to me to obligate them to seek not a specific outcome, and not even a set of discrete, specific outcomes, but rather to bring about a vaguely defined pattern of developmental outcomes on the part of students entrusted to their care. Thus, neither "the maximization of individual potential", as educators sometimes phrase the goal of the school, nor even the more modest "development of the commitments and capacities that are essential prerequisites for future role performances" is a unidimensional conception. Nor is either a conception of advancement on a number of discrete, unrelated dimensions, such that cognitive development in a given area proceeds as rapidly as possible without reference to other aspects of development. Rather, it is a conception of a patterned development on a number of mutually limiting dimensions, with prospective gains in a given area having implications for other areas. Thus, while cognitive development is undoubtedly conceived as pre-eminent, it is also conceived as proceeding in conjunction with and in proportion to other areas, e.g., ability to form stable relationships with peers. From this point of view, the kind of instrumental rationality that is appropriate in education is rationality in pursuit of a pattern of outcomes, not discrete outcomes of however many kinds. Perhaps it might be termed "pattern rationality."

The notion that I have in mind can be classified somewhat through an examination of an analogy suggested by Phillip Jackson (1968). We may think of the teacher, or more generally the school, as confronted by a situation very much like that which confronts the housewife in preparing meals for herself and her husband. She is, naturally, concerned about a variety of goals, each of which may be pursued independently, more or less in accordance with the value of instrumental rationality. On the one hand, she must be concerned about the nutritional value of the food. However, she must also be concerned about its palatability and perhaps its aesthetic appearance, as well as its monetary cost. Clearly, the necessity for some integration of these competing goals sets limits to the degree that any one can be pursued rationally. There is little point in preparing highly nutritional meals if either the appearance or the taste of the food is such that the food does not get eaten.

The situation becomes even more complex when the food is to be consumed

by children as well as adult members of the family. In this case, rational pursuit of even a single goal, say maximizing nutritional value, for one category of consumer may entail costs in the achievement of that goal (as well as others) for another category of consumer. Rational selection among means to achieve nutritional goals in relation to children may contribute to ill health on the part of parents, and vice versa.

Comparable situations in education are easy to identify. At the level of a given student, the means selected to maximize the learning of academic subject matter may limit the degree to which the goal of developing initiative can be attained. To take an example that is closer to home, personally, teachers may find the use of peer pressure and criticism to be a highly effective means of controlling student behavior. However, the use of that means of maintaining control can be seen as a serious threat to the development of capacities to exercise independent judgment and act autonomously.

At the level of multiple learners, the means best suited to maximize the learning of a given category of students (by means of homogeneous grouping, for example) may inhibit the learning of another category of students. In addition, certain means, however effective, may be regarded as inherently undesirable.

What the preceding discussion illustrates most clearly is the inseparability of educational means and educational ends. Students learn from the way they are taught, evaluated, and organized, as well as from what they are taught (Dreeben, 1968), and the most effective means of attaining a given goal may impact negatively on efforts to attain another goal. For these and other reasons--among which is the paucity of valid knowledge--instrumental rationality in relation to discrete outcomes has limited applicability in the classroom.

The conclusion to which the foregoing considerations lead me is this. However much our preparation programs need to emphasize the rational pursuit of educational outcomes (and I do not discount that need), we need just as consciously to recognize and emphasize that the goal or outcome in relation to which effectiveness is to be sought is the development of a pattern of characteristics, not the maximization of discrete outcomes of however many kinds. It is not enough to ". . . insist on broad conceptualizations and measurements of the outcomes of schooling, including the full range of dimensions in the affective as well as cognitive domains" (Boyd, 1981, 8). Without an explicit awareness of the configuration of outcomes, we risk providing the basis for a sequel to Callahan's *Cult of Efficiency* entitled "Education and the Cult of Effectiveness".

The nature of the educational organization. The second major error of omission common to the positions under consideration here lies in their failure to consider the functional status of the school in the societal system, and the implications of that status for the structure and internal and external processes of the social system of the school. That failure leads to certain writers, among whom I include Boyd (1978, 1980), Boyd and Crowson (1981), Meyer and Rowan (1977, 1978), and Michaelsen (1980, 1981), to provide descriptions of schools couched in such phrases as "pervasive goal-displacement", "perverse incentive

structures", "ritual classifications", "ceremonial rules and rituals", "allocative and technical inefficiency", "technological incoherence", "de facto ownership" and "maximization of private welfare". And it leads them to ask why, when the avowed primary purpose of the schools is the "production of valued student outcomes", they display so little evidence of concern for the measurement of such outcomes and the use of those measurements in the evaluation of the performance of teachers and schools; why they adhere so slavishly to such categorical rules as those concerning teacher certification, curricular topics, student services, etc.; why the evaluative emphasis is on inputs; and why they fail so consistently to satisfy what the economist takes to be the public's interest in the efficient production of educational services. Those same authors--with the exception of Meyer and Rowan--would have us redirect incentive structures, research, preparation, and practice toward a primary concern for the efficient and effective production of educational outcomes.

The problem with these suggestions is that they attempt to apply to the school normative standards and forms of social organization that are inconsistent with its functions and with the conditions of its survival.

In the first place, neither efficiency nor effectiveness is the paramount normative standard applicable to educational organizations. Although both obviously are applicable, both are subordinate to, or at least tempered by, others. Michaelsen (1980,1981) takes great pains to explain why it is that public school organizations deviate from efficiency norms, or fail to advance the presumptive public interest in the efficient production of educational services. The obvious answer is that there is no departure to be explained; norms other than efficiency take precedence, and the public's interest in the efficient production of educational services is subordinate to its interest in other aspects of the schools' operation. Moreover, in attempting to evaluate activity in relation to the "legitimate expression of demand for it", Michaelsen (1980,6) assumes that the supply of an activity should be determined by demand as expressed through markets involving either money or political power, neglecting what in one set of terms would be referred to as "influence" and "generalized commitment" markets (Parsons, 1969).

Meyer and Rowan (1977, 1978) also attempt to explain the presumed goal displacement in schools, the lack of concern for the measurement and control of outputs, and the lack of attention to standards of instrumental rationality in the selection and maintenance of elements of formal structure (i.e., departments, positions, policies, programs, technical procedures, etc.). In their view, these elements of structure are selected and legitimated on the basis of criteria other than their impact on work outcomes. Their arguments seem more defensible to me than Michaelsen's, but stop short of being adequate.

Although the basis for the criticisms just advanced has been outlined in detail elsewhere (Hills, 1975,1976), it may be useful to summarize aspects of it here. In one set of terms, the school is a societal mechanism for the mobilization of resources and the organization of collective action in the interest of the attainment of collectively significant goals. Not only is it

a member of the category of social structure differentiated with reference to the attainment of collective goals, but it is also, in one of its aspects, a structural unit of the polity, or goal-attainment subsystem, of the societal system.

As an element of the goal-attainment subsystem of the societal system, the school is expected to contribute to collective effectiveness by getting valued things done effectively in its own sphere. Contributing to collective effectiveness is presumed to take priority over such alternatives as contributing to the utility of available resources or the solidarity of the societal system. In this respect, the school is no different from other specific function collectivities, such as business firms, governmental bureaus, and universities. However, it is very different from the first two of these, in that in another of its aspects it is an element of the fiduciary subsystem of the societal system, i.e., the subsystem concerned with the maintenance of the integrity of the cultural patterns that define the distinctive nature of, and provide the continuity for, the societal system. At the technical level, the fiduciary subsystem is concerned with the "maintenance or creative modification of motivational or cultural components of the social system (properties of units)" (Parsons, 1959).

Elements of the fiduciary subsystem, including those subject to effectiveness as an evaluative standard, are evaluated in terms of the degree to which their activities constitute contributions to the maintenance of the integrity of the defining cultural patterns. For elements of the fiduciary subsystem, normative standards call for a subordination of the criterion of effectiveness to the criterion of integrity of commitment to values. Such elements are expected, above all, to engage in actions that are expressive of and/or implement the value patterns ascribed to them in their status in the societal system, independent of the adaptive, goal-attainment, and integrative problems of that system (Parsons, 1954). Whereas elements of the adaptive and goal-attainment subsystems of society are evaluated in relation to criteria emphasizing what they do, or what can be done with their products (performances, in pattern-variable terms), elements of the fiduciary subsystem are evaluated in relation to criteria emphasizing the authentic manifestation attributes ascribed to elements of that sort in the system reference (qualities, in pattern-variable terms).

Perhaps the significance of the preceding assertions can be made more clear through a comparison of the normative conditions under which organizations with economic and fiduciary primacy operate, and the manner in which the two types of organizations "market" their products. As in the case of any formal organization, the business firm is subject to evaluation in terms of its effectiveness in getting valued things done. However, it is also subject to evaluation in terms of the degree to which its products constitute additions to the utility of resources. Since utility is symbolized and measured by money, the firm can make a genuine contribution to utility only if the monetary value of its products exceeds the monetary cost of the resources used in their production. The condition of having made such a contribution is termed "solvency", which is the standard of successful performance of economic functions. With certain exceptions, firms that fail to make a contribution to utility in

the long run--i.e., which are more than temporarily insolvent--are subject to liquidation.

Now it is often pointed out that the consumer reigns sovereign in the economic market place, and it is sometimes argued that many of the ills of schools would be remedied if only that were the case in education. There are two main reasons why that is a pernicious argument. In the first place, the consumer is not unconditionally sovereign in the economic market place. Given the necessity of making a contribution to utility--and, by definition, of maintaining solvency--the firm will produce only those outputs, utilize only those resources, and adopt only those structural arrangements and technical procedures that are deemed compatible with the maintenance of its long-run solvency. No matter how great the demand for a product, if it does not exceed the cost of production, the product will not be produced. Thus, consumer sovereignty is limited by the obligation of the firms to contribute to the enhancement of the utility of resources as evidenced by solvency.

That's the first point. The second and main one concerns the assumption that the delivery of educational service could, without loss, be patterned after the economic market model in which the "supplier", bearing no responsibility other than that of responding responsibility to demand within existing institutional arrangements, simply turns the product over to a consumer with whom no special relationship is maintained, and on behalf of whom no special responsibility is exercised. There is a sense in which the school is the supplier of educational services vis-a-vis students and their families. However, that formulation omits both the relationship of solidarity between teacher and student that is essential to effective socialization, and the fiduciary responsibilities of the school. In the latter connection, units bearing such responsibilities act as trustees of certain societal interests, as in the case of the academic professions that hold in trust the interest of society and its members in the cognitive cultural tradition (Parsons and Platt, 1973). More broadly, fiduciary associations--which include kinship units, religious associations, and educational-cultural organizations--exercise, and are expected to exercise, responsibility for the maintenance and/or development of a trans-generational tradition (Parsons, 1977).

In the university case a particularly conspicuous focus of fiduciary responsibility is members of faculties, both vis-a-vis students who do not yet command the same level of competence and experience, and vis-vis the integrity of the tradition itself, in this case with a special concern for the "advancement of knowledge". (Parsons, 1977, 388)

Parents bear a similar responsibility for the "welfare and proper bringing up" of their children (Parsons, 1977), as do schools in relation to their students and to the transgenerational traditions that constitute both the explicit and implicit curricula. Schools exercise a fiduciary responsibility on behalf of other sectors of society, and such responsibility must be grounded in commitment to the values that legitimize the existence of the school in the first place. Thus, the exercise of fiduciary responsibility by university.

faculties is grounded in commitment to the value pattern "cognitive rationality", which entails an obligation to contribute to the transmission, application, and advancement of knowledge (Parsons and Platt, 1973). Similarly, although the level of responsibility is lower than in the case of the university, the fiduciary obligations borne by the public schools are grounded in commitments to the values discussed in a preceding section. And, their primary concern tends to be, not the meeting of the presumptive public interest in the efficient production of educational services, and not the maximization of a set of specific educational outcomes, but rather, integrity in the faithful discharge of fiduciary responsibilities, in the fulfillment of the responsibilities of their trusteeship. The standard of successful performance of fiduciary responsibilities is not solvency, but pattern-consistency, i.e., consistency of action with value commitments.

To make the parallel between the economic and educational cases more clear, we may say that just as the firm has an obligation to produce no products, utilize no resources, and adopt no structural arrangements or production procedures that threaten its solvency, so the school has an obligation to produce no outcomes, utilize no resources, and adopt no structural arrangements or educational procedures that are inconsistent with the values that legitimize its existence. Another way of stating the case is to say that the business firm is governed by a rational choice mechanism termed "economic rationality".

Acting in accord with economic rationality means to decide about possible means-end relations, involving both selectivity about means and ends in the social realm, in such a fashion as to maximize general utilities. (Baum, 1976, 461)

In contrast, the school is governed by the standard of "moral rationality", acting in accord with which means selecting among both ends and means with a view to implementing value commitments independently of their impact on utilities, effectiveness, or solidary relations. Thus, while it seems quite correct to say, as Meyer and Rowan do (1977, 1978), that the structure of the school reflects its institutional environment, it seems very incorrect to suggest that that reflection is of only ritual or ceremonial significance. In any case, I should add to my list of what's needed in the preparation programs for educational leaders an emphasis on the acquisition of a broad conception of the functional location of the school in the societal system and of the implications of that status for its structure and processes.

What's Next

What is next in the preparation of educational leaders? Given the incurable optimism of the person in whose honor this conference is being held, it would be particularly fitting to answer that question with a glowing forecast of solid improvements within the next decade. However, fitting or not, I have concluded that the most realistic answer is, "Very little that's significantly different from what's extant."

I arrived at the unhappy conclusion unwillingly after a considerable

period of on-again-off-again efforts to discover realistic grounds for one that is more cheerful. Those efforts led me to recognize more clearly than I have in the past some of the conditions that limit our capacity to design and implement programs which have the result that, other things being equal, those who complete them are demonstrably more effective in performing administrative functions than those who do not. The on-again-off-again process referred to involved the consideration of a variety of approaches to program design, and the limiting conditions alluded to are of three sorts: (1) those imposed by the nature of administrative practice; (2) those imposed by the state of knowledge relevant to administrative practice; and (3) those imposed by the characteristics of university departments of educational administration. In what follows I shall treat in turn the limitations of each sort.

Limiting Conditions Imposed by the Nature of Administrative Practice

My awareness of the two major limiting conditions imposed by the nature of administrative practice grew out of my own experience as an administrator, first as an elementary school principal, and more recently as a university department head. Both can be stated quite simply. First, as I have observed elsewhere (Hills, 1975), the variety of subjects, issues, and problems that arises in the life of a school administrator is so great that there isn't a ghost of a chance of providing specific preparation for dealing with all of them. One might say that Murphy's Law has been amended to read, "Everything that can go wrong will, and there are more things that can go wrong than anyone can anticipate and prepare specifically for." Whatever else is next in the preparation of educational leaders, it certainly is not likely to be the development of competence at the level of specific problems. By competence, I mean,

[T]he capacity of an individual personality to achieve a goal by processes of choice in which valid and significant knowledge play a focal part, if not in commitment to the values or even the goal in question, in choosing and implementing the procedure by which goal-attainment processes operate. (Parsons and Platt, 1973, 68)

The second limiting condition imposed by the nature of administrative practice concerns the kinds of problems that the administrator is called upon to solve. As observed earlier, some considerable portion of administrative attention is directed toward the management of the normal, day-to-day functioning of the organization. However, there are occasions on which non-routine situations or problems arise which have two important characteristics. First, they can be handled, or solved, after a fashion, in a number of different ways, the relative merits of which are seldom known. And second, a satisfactory solution must meet multiple criteria, if only in the sense that the solution must solve the given problem without creating new ones. For example, suppose the problem is to create a mechanism for academic planning within a faculty of education. Obviously, one would wish the mechanism to work effectively, i.e., to yield high-quality plans. But equally obviously, one would want it to unite, or at least not fragment, the faculty. And one would want it to earn the support of, or at least not alienate, practitioners and their associations, and so on. My experience leads me to suggest that more administrative problems are of this nature than are not, and

that that fact imposes serious limits to how genuinely preparatory preparation programs can be, at least in the sense of developing competence as previously defined.

Limiting Conditions Imposed by the State of Knowledge

There are two sub-classes of limitations within this category of limitation, one concerning the state of knowledge relevant to administrative practice, and one concerning the state of knowledge relevant to the preparation of administrators. Each will be treated in turn.

Limiting conditions imposed by the state of knowledge relevant to the practice of administration. Some of my colleagues disagree strongly on these points, but I believe that the following assertions represent accurately the state of knowledge in the field of educational administration.

(1) The number of tested solutions to administrative problems available for inclusion in preparation programs is severely limited. That statement requires qualification because there is a sense in which existing organizational structures and processes in education constitute a complex of tested solutions to administrative and organizational problems--problems concerning who is to teach what, to whom, where, with what facilities, etc. In this sense, several problem solutions are available, and these clinically tested solutions are built into existing arrangements. However, when one wishes to know which of several demonstrably workable solutions to a given problem is most satisfactory in terms of some criterion, or when problems arise within the framework of existing arrangements, the situation is quite different.

(2) The number of firmly validated empirical generalizations that are both relevant to the practice of administration and directly useful is relatively small. I consider directly useful those generalizations in which a substantial percentage of the variance in a dependent variable of concern is accounted for by independent variables that are subject to control.

(3) There are few, if any, well-validated theories that are relevant to the practice of administration. Moreover, available formulations often have contradictory implications for both practice and preparation. Consider, for example, the implications that might be drawn from the works of Michaelsen (1980, 1981), Meyer and Rowan (1977, 1978), and Ouchi and associates (1978a, 1978b, 1980, 1981). Given the Michaelsen formulation and some rather obvious value premises, one would almost certainly advocate the development of goal-consensus, the linking of incentives to performance, and the closing of the points of so-called "loose-coupling" within school districts. One might also be inclined to attempt to eliminate the bi-lateral monopoly relationship between producer and "de jure owners" by encouraging competition. However, given the Meyer-Rowan formulation and the same value premises, one would avoid those actions with great care, for fear of threatening the legitimacy and jeopardizing the survival of the organization. If one were to attempt to make any major change in the structure of the educational organization, it would be only after the institutionalized rules defining "proper" education, both within the school and in the broader society, had been changed.

On the other hand, if one were to take seriously the work of Ouchi and his associates, none of the preceding would be of concern. One would set out as systematically as possible to convert schools and school districts into "type Z" organizations--organizations characterized by intimacy, subtlety, trust, long-term employment, and collective-consensual decision-making; infrequent, informal, and implicit evaluation; slow promotion; non-specialized career paths; and holistic concern for people.

Few would dispute the claim that generalized cognitive content of preparation programs has increased significantly over the past three decades. At the same time, it seems clear to me that none could dispute convincingly the assertions just advanced. In fact, I believe that one could say without too much fear of contradiction that if we were to exclude from preparation programs everything except tested problem solutions, well-validated, useful empirical generalizations, and well-validated theories, we would reduce their length by at least 75 per cent.

Limiting conditions imposed by the state of knowledge relevant to the preparation of administrators. The preceding characterization of the state of the art may be overdrawn, but if it bears any resemblance at all to the actual situation it poses a very serious question. The question is, "If we are ill-prepared to provide prospective administrators with tested solutions to the practical problems they encounter in the practice of their profession, and if we are ill-prepared to provide them with either well validated empirical generalizations or theoretical principles on which to base solutions of their own invention, then what can we do in our programs that is genuinely preparatory, beyond such obvious things as present information about current practices, legal requirements. etc.?"

The answer generally given to that question, when it is taken seriously enough to warrant an answer--which seems rather infrequent--is that we can provide them with "sensitizing concepts" (Gross, 1963), "alternative ways of viewing the world" (Charters, 1960), "aids to insight and understanding that transcend prescriptions and techniques" (Halpin, 1958), and "general conceptions or paradigms of the human being and human behavior" (Getzels, 1969). I quite agree with the authors of these phrases, that we can and undoubtedly do provide prospective administrators with sensitizing concepts and with general conceptions of the human being. However, given the limited number of relevant and useful generalizations statable in terms of those concepts, and given the tentativeness with which the general conceptions must be regarded, it is not at all clear to me how possession of them can affect administrators' behavior in ways that can be considered beneficial. We are limited in our capacity to mount effective preparation programs because we know neither how, nor with what consequences, the administrator uses sensitizing concepts and general paradigms, and we have no idea what implications answers to those questions hold for the conduct of preparation programs. I have suggested elsewhere (Hills, 1981) that the primary benefit to be gained from possession of such concepts and conceptions is enhanced capacity to formulate problems in ways that increase the likelihood of finding acceptable solutions, but I can provide nothing beyond anecdotal evidence to support that suggestion.

Another kind of knowledge that is both relevant to the preparation of administrators and seriously lacking was alluded to early in this presentation. There reference was made to our lack of knowledge about states of educational organizations that impair their effectiveness. However, a wide variety of situations other than those which might conceivably impair effectiveness are considered problematic by administrators. These may include such disparate situations as violation of rules and regulations, conflict between personnel, or between segments of the organization, client dissatisfaction, and so on. Not only do we not know clearly what sorts of problems occur and with what frequency in a given level or type of educational organization, we do not know clearly what variations exist between different levels and types. Having occupied both positions, I have no hesitation in saying that the problems confronting an elementary school principal are in some ways very, very, different from those confronting a university department head. Yet, I know of no source to which one might go to acquire detailed and generalized information about those differences. The point of all this, of course, is that lack of knowledge of specifically what we are preparing persons for limits our capacity to provide genuinely preparatory experiences.

Limiting Conditions Imposed by Characteristics of Departments of Educational Administration

The final set of conditions that seems to me to limit our capacity to design and implement programs that are genuinely preparatory, in the sense specified earlier, is that which comprises the characteristics of university departments of educational administration. It is, undoubtedly, as risky to attempt to generalize about the characteristics of such departments as it is to generalize about public schools. However, at the risk of sweeping on to the grand fallacy, I suggest that the following characteristics are shared widely among such departments.

1. Many elements of formal structure-- offices, programs, policies, procedures, and technologies--are taken for granted as legitimate, quite apart from any demonstrable impact on the competence of graduates to fulfill the requirements of practice effectively. For example, there is no reason to believe that the fulfillment of the requirement for a dissertation contributes to the professional competence of the administrator.
2. There is next to no inclination to measure outputs, or to assess the consequences of program or instructional policies and procedures. Put another way, there seems to be a little or no interest in evaluating the success of preparation programs in the development of clinical competence.
3. The criteria of worth applied to personnel, policies and programs are of external origin, and they have

little to do with the extent of contribution to the developement of clinical competence.

4. The institutional enviroment is reflected ceremonially in the structure of departments of educational administration. The environment in this case is the set of academic disciplines that make up the university.
5. Technical performance and output quality in the instructional realm are rarely monitored.
6. Goals are ambiguous and categorical rather than clear and technical.
7. Activities are maintained quite apart from any evidence concerning their contributions to the development of students' clinical competence.

If that set of characteristics seems familiar, it is probably because they have been culled and adapted from Meyer's and Rowan's discussions of institutional organizations (1977, 1978). While I disagree with their explanation of why educational organizations exhibit the characteristics mentioned, I find little in the description itself with which to argue, when applied to the departments of educational administration with which I am familiar. I would suggest that, while it is both appropriate and functionally necessary that the values of the university be institutionalized in such departments, I would also suggest that those departments have failed to institutionalize value systems that are differentiated in a direction made appropriate by their status as agencies preparing persons for practice in an applied profession. As suggested earlier, the applied professions are rooted simultaneously in the cognitive culture of the academic system and in the practical needs of the society and its members (Parsons and Platt, 1973). For the applied professional, the focus of fiduciary responsibility is the utilization of cognitive resources in the interest of the attainment of practical goals. Hence, ". . . the faculty of the university professional school must pay adequate attention to its clinical branches and bring about some kind of synthesis between the roles of its basic scientists and its clinicians . . ." (Parsons and Platt, 1973, 258). Moreover,

. . . the attempt should not be for the direct transmission of knowledge and of the competence characteristic of the pure academic role for practical professional use; instead, this transmission should be mediated by a process of adjustment to the needs of practice, essentially through the clinical focus appropriate to the profession. (Parsons and Platt, 1973, 258)

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Reference to the concept of "clinical focus" brings this discussion full circle. It began with reiteration of the suggestion that what's needed in the preparation of educational leaders is an emphasis on a well focused clinical concern for the effectiveness of educational organizations in the attainment of collective goals, and the prevention and remediation of conditions that impair effectiveness. Subsequent discussion suggested several other needs, including the grounding of preparation programs in the following: (1) a holistic conception of practice, emphasizing the maintenance of essential functions of the administrator more systematic than those couched in every-day-language terms; (3) an understanding of the value system that legitimates the structures and processes of public schools, and the implications of that system for the currently espoused emphasis on outcomes; and (4) an understanding of the function of the school in the societal system, of the constraints that imposes on the school, and of the implications of both for administrative practice.

Discussion then turned to the question of what's next in the preparation of educational leaders. It began with the conclusion that what's next is not likely to be very different from what's extant, and then attempted to justify that conclusion by means of reference to a set of conditions that were held to limit our capacity to design and implement preparation programs that are demonstrably effective in improving the professional competence of administrators. These limiting conditions included: (1) aspects of the nature of administrative practice; (2) lack of tested problem solutions; valid, relevant, and useful empirical generalizations; and valid theoretical principles; (3) lack of knowledge relevant to the design and implementation of preparation programs; and (4) lack of differentiation of departments of educational administration from the academic disciplines. I do not doubt that there are other answers to the question, "What's needed . . .?"--for instance, the turning of some of our research efforts on the question of how to prepare administrators effectively--and I do not doubt that there are other answers to the question, "What's next . . .?". However, on the basis of the points outlined, and nearly two and one-half decades of affiliation-- in one capacity or another--with departments of educational administration I do not expect to miss the mark too far.

References

- Baum, Ranier C., "Introduction" in Jan J. Loubser, et al., Explorations in General Theory in Social Science: Essays in Honor of Talcott Parsons. (New York: The Free Press, 1976, 448-469.)
- Boyd, William L., "The Study of Educational Policy and Politics: Much Ado About Nothing?" Teachers College Record, 80(2), 1978, 249-271.
- Boyd, William L., "Policy Analysis in Educational Administration: Its Promise and Challenge", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, 1981.
- Boyd, William L., and Robert L. Crowson, "The Changing Conception and Practice of Public School Administration", in David C. Berliner, (ed.) Review of Research in Education, Vol. 9, American Educational Research Association, 1981.
- Charters, W.W., Jr., "Improving Administrative Theory & Practice: Three Essential Roles", in Roald F. Campbell and James M. Lipham (eds.) Administrative Theory as a Guide to Action. (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1960.)
- Dreeben, Robert, On What is Learned in School. (Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.)
- Erickson, Donald, "An Overdue Paradigm Shift in Educational Administration: Or How Can We Get That Idiot Off the Freeway?" in L. L. Cunningham, et al. (eds.) Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977(a))
- Erickson, Donald, Educational Organization and Administration. (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977(b))
- Erickson, D.A., "Research on Educational Administration: The State of the Art", Educational Researcher, 8(3), 1979, 9-14.
- Getzels, Jacob W., "Paradigm and Practice: On the Contributions of Research to Educational Practice", Educational Researcher, No. 5, 1969.
- Cross, Neal, "The Use and Abuse of Sociological Inquiry in Training Programs for Educational Administrators", in L. W. Downey and F. Enns (eds.), The Social Sciences and Educational Administration. (Edmonton: Division of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1963.)

- Hills, Jean, "What Educators 'Really' Do: A Parsonian View of Education", in William G. Monahan (ed.) Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration. (New York: Macmillan, 1975, 233-261.)
- Hills, Jean, "The Preparation of Administrators: Some Observations from the 'Firing Line,'" Educational Administration Quarterly, 11(3), 1975(b), 1-20.
- Hills, Jean, "The Public School as a Type of Organization" in Jan J. Loubser, et al., (eds.) Explorations in General Theory in Social Science: Essays in Honor of Talcott Parsons, Vol. II. (New York: The Free Press, 1976(a), 829-856.)
- Hills, Jean, "Societal and Educational Values in the United States and Canada: A Tentative Comparison", Mimeograph, 1976(b).
- Hills, Jean, "Quibbles with Kerlinger and Hoy", U.C.E.A. Review, XX(3), 1979(a), 7-12.
- Hills, Jean, "Theory Development in Educational Administration: A Solution to What Problem", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, 1979(b).
- Hills, Jean, "Critical Issues in the Preparation of Educational Administrators in North America", in Robin H. Farquhar and Ian E. Housego (eds.) Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration. (Vancouver: Centre for Continuing Education, The University of British Columbia, 1980), 224-235.
- Hills, Jean, "Conceptual-Analytical Skills for Administrators", Mimeograph, 1981, 120 pp.
- Jackson, Phillip W., Life in Classrooms. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.)
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan, "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth & Ceremony", American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 1977, 340-363.
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan, "The Structure of Educational Organizations" in Marshall W. Meyer and Associates, Environments and Organizations. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.)
- Ouchi, William G., "Markets, Clans, and Bureaucracies", Administrative Science Quarterly, 25(1), 1980, 129-141.
- Ouchi, William G., Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge. (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1981.)

- Ouchi, William G., and Alfred M. Jaeger, "Type Z Organization: Stability in the Midst of Mobility", Academy of Management Review, 3(2), 1978, 305-314.
- Ouchi, William G., and Jerry B. Johnson, "Types of Organizational Control and Their Relationship to Emotional Well Being", Administrative Science Quarterly, 23(1), 1978(a), 294-317.
- Michaelsen, Jacob B., "The Political Economy of School District Administration", Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(3), 1981, 98-113.
- Michaelsen, Jacob B., "A Theory of Decision-Making in the Public Schools: A Public Choice Approach" in Samuel B. Bacharach, (ed.) Organizational Behavior in Schools and School Districts. (New York: Praeger, in press.)
- Parsons, Talcott, Essays in Sociological Theory (Revised Edition). (New York: The Free Press, 1954.)
- Parsons, Talcott, "General Theory in Sociology" in Robert K. Merton, et al. (eds.) Sociology Today. (New York: Basic Books, 1959, 3-38.)
- Parsons, Talcott, Structure and Process in Modern Societies. (New York: The Free Press, 1964.)
- Parsons, Talcott, Politics and Social Structure. (New York: The Free Press, 1969.)
- Parsons, Talcott, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory. (New York: The Free Press, 1977.)
- Parsons, Talcott, Action Theory and the Human Condition. (New York: The Free Press, 1978.)
- Parsons, Talcott, and Gerald R. Platt, The American University. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.)
- Spady, William G., "Outcome-Based Instructional Management: A Sociological Perspective", Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education, 1981.
- Willower, Donald J., "Contemporary Issues in Theory in Educational Administration", Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(3), 1980.

ABOUT UCEA

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) is a nonprofit corporation whose members are major universities in the United States and Canada. Thirty school districts are affiliated with UCEA.

History

In 1954, members of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (Middle Atlantic Region) proposed an organization which would be devoted to improving the professional preparation of educational administrators. To help establish such an organization, a central office with part-time staff was established on the campus of Columbia University, financed by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to Teachers College of Columbia.

Between 1956 and 1959, with the help of the staff at the Teachers College office, UCEA's constitution and by-laws were formulated, the organization's purposes were defined, and additional financial support was obtained in the form of a five-year grant from the Kellogg Foundation. The UCEA central office was moved to its present location on the campus of The Ohio State University in 1959 and a small, full-time staff was hired.

Since its inception, the Council has worked to improve the professional preparation of administrative personnel in both continuing education and pre-service programs. UCEA has been a major contributor to:

1. Broadening the content of preparation programs for educational administrators.
2. Extending use of more effective methods of inquiry in educational administration.
3. Shifting educational administration from an anecdotal orientation to a more scientific one, leading to generalizations about organization and leadership.
4. Developing new instructional materials for administrator programs.
5. Fostering exchanges in research and in program development between professors and administrative leaders in the U.S. and their counterparts in other countries.
6. Continuing efforts toward standards of excellence in research and in preparation programs for administrative personnel in educational administration.

More recently, the Council also has focused considerable attention on strengthening relationships between institutions that prepare administrators for service and the school districts and other agencies in which administrators serve. The major means to accomplish this has been the UCEA University and School District Partnership described later in this document.

UCEA GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

UCEA engages in a variety of activities and produces a number of publications and instructional materials. All these activities and products proceed from a basic set of goals sufficiently stable to give the organization identity, yet flexible enough to respond to changing conditions in educational administration.

Goals

Briefly stated, UCEA goals are:

- To advance understanding in all areas relating to educational administration and to enhance the research capability of participating institutions.

- To develop better methods of instruction, new materials, and other approaches to help bring about more effective pre-service and staff development programs for all professionals in educational administration.
- To create more effective pathways and networks for exchanging new understandings and better methods among persons working to advance educational administration.

Program Activities

A representative sample of the many types of activities sponsored by UCEA follows:

- Inter-institutional research projects on such subjects as principalship effectiveness, education policy, and managing resources.
- Articulation of new directions for research and training — for example, in formulating research perspectives, in preparing leaders to anticipate the future, and in establishing criteria for administrator certification.
- Development and testing of training programs for administrators that make effective use of resources in other disciplines — for example, strengthening the humanities in administrator preparation programs.
- Professional renewal opportunities for member institutions — for example, seminars and workshops on subjects such as methods of research, preparing leaders for the future, and coping with the challenges of urban education.
- Involvement of graduate students from member institutions in professional seminars, institutes, and conferences and in research and development projects.
- Creation of new organizations — the UCEA University and School District Partnership and the Inter-American Society for Educational Administration.

Publications

- **Educational Administration Quarterly** (established in 1965), a journal containing conceptual and theoretical articles, research analyses, and reviews of books in educational administration.
- **Educational Administration Abstracts** (established in 1966), a journal produced through the cooperative efforts of UCEA institutions containing brief summaries of articles from approximately 140 professional journals.
- **Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership** (first published in 1980), a periodical devoted to consideration of equity-related educational needs of Hispanics, Blacks, American Indians, Asian-Americans, women, and other groups.
- **UCEA REVIEW**, an in-house periodical that provides up-to-date information on UCEA activities and news from member universities and Partnership school districts.

In addition, UCEA regularly aids in the production and distribution of a wide range of books, monographs, special reports, and other media.

Instructional Materials

UCEA is especially concerned with the need to develop instructional materials that will improve administrator preparation programs. A number of games and simulations have been developed for this purpose, including the "Monroe City" urban simulation, developed and demonstrated in various parts of the U.S. and Canada by more than 180 professors from 40 universities. The most recent UCEA training tool is the Adams Simulation, which contains five simulations of administrative positions in a suburban school district.



The University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (614) 422-2564